



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,501	06/23/2005	Patrice Hameau	HAMEAU2	2706

1444	7590	06/13/2007
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.		
624 NINTH STREET, NW		
SUITE 300		
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303		

EXAMINER	
CHEN, SHIN HON	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/13/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/540,501

Applicant(s)

HAMEAU ET AL.

Examiner

Shin-Hon Chen

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2 and 4-21 have been examined.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9 and 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hartlieb et al. PCT WO02/057905 translation provided in U.S. Pub. No. 20040019802 (hereinafter Hartlieb).

4. As per claim 1, Hartlieb discloses a method for securing a computer system which comprises at least a code interpretation module and memory capacity for storing a interpreted code having measurable physical imprints provided from said code interpretation module, wherein in order to make more difficult attacks based on physical measurements or requiring synchronization with said interpreted code (Hartlieb: [0007]), it consists of introducing at least two types of alternatives in the execution time of the interpreted code, which have an effect on the execution times of the interpreted code or on its measurable physical imprint, said alternatives being introduced according to at least one of the following steps: a first step of causing at certain places of an interpreted code bypasses towards new portions of code which do not belong to the original code in order to complicate the synchronization and the physical

Art Unit: 2131

imprint of the execution (Hartlieb: [0017]: insert new code into original code), and/or a second phase of proposing a plurality of implementations of certain instructions, each requiring a different execution time and/or having a different physical imprint and providing an identical result, so that two executions of one of said certain instructions within a same code may be performed by two implementations (Hartlieb: [0019]: change the execution times of each execution).

5. As per claim 2, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses wherein the said first way in the execution times of the interpreted codes comprises a first mode of introducing bypass codes including bypass instruction in certain particular locations of the interpreted code, said introducing mode being made at each execution upon generating the interpreted code by a code generator (Hartlieb: [0018]: the decoder generates and implants the dummy code into the original commands).

6. As per claim 4, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses wherein said step of causing bypasses comprises a first mode for introducing "bypass codes" consisting of introducing one or more instructions specific to certain particular locations of the code, either manually or automatically during the generation of the aforesaid code (Hartlieb: [0017]: predefined or random locations of a program).

7. As per claim 6, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses wherein the step of causing bypasses comprises a second mode for introducing "bypass codes"

Art Unit: 2131

consisting of introducing the bypass code in the implementation of the interpreter itself (Hartlieb: [0018]).

8. As per claim 7, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 6. Hartlieb further discloses wherein the bypass code introduced into the implementation of the interpreter is executed either systematically by the interpreter or selectively or randomly (Hartlieb: [0017]).

9. As per claim 8, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses wherein said step of causing bypasses comprises a first mode for realizing "bypass codes" consisting of performing a so-called "superfluous" calculation depending on data known at execution (Hartlieb: [0019]: dummy code sequence).

10. As per claim 9, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses wherein said step of causing bypasses comprises a second mode for realizing "bypass codes" consisting of providing the aforesaid first mode with a random draw of an extra datum during the execution of the superfluous calculation, said extra datum being used in the calculation performed by the bypass code (Hartlieb: [0016]).

11. As per claim 11, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses wherein said step of causing bypasses comprises a third mode for realizing "bypass codes" consisting of replacing in the aforesaid first and second modes the test for deciding on the next action by a branching in an indirection table containing the addresses of possible actions at an

Art Unit: 2131

index calculated from variable items (dynamical datum and/or result from a random draw) (Hartlieb: [0018]).

12. As per claim 12, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses wherein said step of causing bypasses comprises a fourth mode for realizing "bypass codes" consisting of performing a superfluous calculation having the external characteristics of a particular sensitive calculation (Hartlieb: [0019]: dummy calculations).

13. As per claim 13, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses a first mode for introducing a plurality of implementations of certain instructions consisting of enriching the set of instructions recognized by the interpreter with a plurality of implementations for a given instruction (Hartlieb: [0017]); the aforesaid instructions are performed either manually by programming or automatically upon code generation (Hartlieb: [0018]).

14. As per claim 14, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses a second mode for introducing the aforesaid plurality of implementations of certain instructions consisting of comprising in the actual implementation of the instruction, a branching to a portion of at least one alternative code with a variable physical imprint or duration, which dynamically determines the implementation to be executed (Hartlieb: [0019]).

15. As per claim 15, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 14. Hartlieb further discloses a first mode for realizing the aforesaid alternative code consisting of proposing a plurality of

Art Unit: 2131

different implementations of the instruction and by conditioning the choice of the executed version to a dynamical test, i.e., depending on data known at execution (Hartlieb: [0019]).

16. As per claim 16, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 14. Hartlieb further discloses a second mode for introducing the aforesaid plurality of implementations of certain instructions consisting of comprising in the actual implementation of the instruction, a branching to a portion of at least one alternative code with a variable physical imprint or duration, which dynamically determines the implementation to be executed (Hartlieb: [0019]).

17. As per claim 17, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 14. Hartlieb further discloses a third mode for realizing the aforesaid "alternative code" consisting of improving the aforesaid first and second modes for realizing "alternative codes" consisting of replacing the test for deciding on the selected version with a branching in an indirection table containing the addresses of the available version at an index calculated for variable items (Hartlieb: [0018]: random addresses).

18. As per claim 18, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses being implemented on a module for interpreting software code, a so-called virtual machine (Hartlieb: [0018]: decoder).

Art Unit: 2131

19. As per claim 19, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 19. Hartlieb further discloses that the decoder interprets the decode and the decoder includes but is not limited to virtual machine in Java platform (Hartlieb: [0018]).

20. As per claim 20, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses the method being implemented on a module for interpreting physical code (Hartlieb: [0016]).

21. As per claim 21, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 1. Hartlieb further discloses the method being implemented on an embedded system and on an interpretation module of the microcontroller or microprocessor type (Hartlieb: [0016]).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartlieb in view of Collberg et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6668325 (hereinafter Collberg).

24. As per claim 5, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 4. Hartlieb does not explicitly disclose wherein the bypass instructions are associated with security levels which correspond to complexity levels of their bypass code, the most complex being considered as the most defensive



Art Unit: 2131

with regard to security attacks requiring synchronization with the code or measurement of its physical imprint. However, Collberg discloses an obfuscation method that obfuscates program code based on the security level desired (Collberg: column 2 lines 26-39). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to obfuscate code based on the security measures because both prior art discloses obfuscating techniques. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Collberg within the system of Hartlieb because it makes sure that frequently executed parts of the application are not obfuscated by very expensive transformations to maintain efficiency (Collberg: column10 lines 62-64).

25. As per claim 10, Hartlieb discloses the method of claim 8. Hartlieb does not explicitly disclose wherein the aforesaid first mode for realizing "bypass codes" is improved by attaching different security levels to the implementations of instructions and associating them with all the more complex implementations. However, Collberg discloses an obfuscation method that obfuscates program code based on the security level desired (Collberg: column 2 lines 26-39). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to obfuscate code based on the security measures because both prior art discloses obfuscating techniques. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Collberg within the system of Hartlieb because it makes sure that frequently executed parts of the application are not obfuscated by very expensive transformations to maintain efficiency (Collberg: column10 lines 62-64).

*Response to Arguments*

26. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2 and 3-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

27. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.


Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shin-Hon Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2131

SC

  
**AYAZ SHEIKH**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**